

REMARKS

Applicant is submitting a Response to the Restriction Requirement dated February 3, 2010. In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner points to seven inventions (I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII) that are related as subcombinations, disclosed as being usable together in a single combination. Specifically, the Groups as defined by the Examiner are indicated below:

Claims 17-27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-38, 40, 90-96 (Group I) are apparently drawn to a process for allowing various parties to access a live video interface to attend a live conference, classified in class 348, subclass 14.08.

Claims 41, 44-45, 50-55, 57, 85-86, 97-98, 108-109, 114-190 (Group II) are apparently drawn to a process for controlling buyer and vendor communication via public data communication links, classified in class 379, subclass 93.12.

Claims 58-60, 62-65, 67-71, 99-101 (Group III) are apparently drawn to a process for exchanging electronic communications between a buyer and a seller for interactive data sharing of video, graphic, and audio data, classified in class 348, subclass 14.01.

Claims 72, 102-103 (Group IV) are apparently drawn to a system for facilitating transactions between buyers and a plurality of vendors, classified in class 379, subclass 93.12.

Claims 73, 104-105 (Group V) are apparently drawn to a method of processing transactions on-line, classified in class 379, subclass 93.24.

Claims 74, 76, 78-82, 84, 106-107 (Group VI) are apparently drawn to a method of directing communications between buyers and vendors, classified in class 379, subclass 93.12.

Claims 88-89, 110-113 (Group VII) are apparently drawn to a method of processing communications on-line, classified in class 379, subclass 93.17.

Applicant respectfully notes that at least Groups II, IV, and VI, are directed to the same class 379 and subclass 93.12, therefore, at the very least the claims in these groups should be examined together. The Examiner has indicated that the Restriction Requirement is proper, citing to reasons, none of which are valid for Groups II, IV, and VI, because there is no serious search and examination burden as the inventions fall in the same classification and subclassification, therefore, the prior art applicable to one would certainly apply to another.

To that end, Applicant provisionally elected before to proceed with the claims of Groups II (Claims 41, 44-45, 50-55, 57, 85-86, 97-98, 108-109, and 114-190), IV (Claims 72 and 102-

Application No.: 10/724,319
Reply to Office Action of: February 3, 2010

103), and VI (Claims 74, 76, 78-82, 84, and 106-107). In the Restriction Requirement dated February 3, 2010, the Examiner requires an election to only one group. Therefore, Applicant provisionally elects the claims of Group II. This election is made with traverse. The reason for traverse is simply that Applicant believes that a search and examination of the claims categorized under Groups I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII of the instant application can be made without serious burden, assuming that the claims describe independent or distinct inventions in the first place. See M.P.E.P. 803.01.

If the Examiner still feels that a restriction requirement is appropriate, Applicant respectfully requests that the claims of Groups I, III, IV, V, VI, and VII be withdrawn from further consideration, and that examination proceed with respect to the claims of Group II. Applicant reserves the right to amend the claims of Groups I, III, IV, V, VI, and VII to fall within the classification of Group II that is elected here and to introduce them in a subsequent submission. Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for examination. Applicant respectfully solicits early allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: March 3, 2010

By: /Reena Kuyper/
Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830

9229 Sunset Blvd., Suite 630
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860